

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on July 21, 2008, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire October 21, 2008.

Claims 1-28 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 101, and Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103.

In the current paper, Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 are amended for clarity. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 USC 101

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 USC 101 for reasons set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. The Examiner suggests "the Examiner suggests remove 'means' from all the claims".

In a telephone interview between Examiner Hu and Applicants' attorney on September 17, 2008, Examiner Hu indicated that changing "means" to "circuitry" will remove the rejections under 35 USC 101. Although Applicants do not feel the removal of "means" from Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 is necessary, Applicants have amended these claims to recite "circuitry" in accordance with the Examiner's request in an effort to expedite allowance of the claims. Applicants wish to point out that the recitations of "circuitry" in the claims are intended solely to indicate that the recited functions are performed in part by a circuit, as described in the specification, but that the various recitations of "circuitry" are not intended to be mutually exclusive (e.g., the "communication circuitry" and "circuitry for transmitting" in claim 26 may include the same circuit, as set forth in the specification), and the recitation of "circuitry" is not

intended to exclude the role of software needed to perform the recited functions in accordance with the descriptions set forth in the specification and understood by those skilled in the art.

No new matter is entered by the amendments to Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27. In view of this amendment reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Lin (USP 6,381,748).

In the telephone interview conducted on September 17, the Examiner suggested that allowance of Claim 1 may be achieved if reading and transmitting of the recited "Internet address" were clearly recited. In view of Applicants' attorney's understanding, Claim 1 is amended herein to recite "circuitry for reading the Internet address associated with the selected channel number from the memory circuit, and for transmitting the Internet address directly onto the Internet..." Applicants believe this amendment overcomes the rejection under 35 USC 103 over Lin for reasons similar to those associated with the allowance of Claims 21 and 26. Should Applicants' attorney's understanding of the Examiner's comments be incorrect, Applicants' attorney apologizes in advance, and requests that the Examiner suggest language that might overcome the rejection.

Claims 2-20 are dependent from Claim 1, and are therefore distinguished over the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.


For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections under 35 USC 103.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present Application.
Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-28 is respectfully
requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the
undersigned at 408-451-5902 to expedite prosecution of this
case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick T. Bever", written over the typed name.

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,834

Customer no. 22888